REMARKS

Status of the Claims

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the instant application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Upon entry of the amendment, claims 1-4, 6, 7, 9, 13-16, 18, 19, 21, 25, 26 and 29-39 will be pending in the application. Of these, claims 1, 13 and 25 are independent. Claims 1, 9, 13, 21, 25, and 29-32 are sought to be amended. Claims 10-12 and 22-24 are sought to be cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 33-39 are sought to be added. Applicant believes that these changes introduce no new matter. Entry and consideration of this amendment are respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 9-16, 18, 19, 21-26 and 29-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lin (U.S. Patent No. 6,707,778) in view of Abe (U.S. Patent No. 6,965,723). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections with regard to the pending claims for at least the following reasons.

Independent claims 1, 13 and 25 have been amended to now recite similar subject matter of: wherein the indication to stop editing includes one of: not executing a skip ahead command for a period of time after executing a previous skip ahead command, not executing a rewind command for a period of time after executing a previous rewind command, and not executing a skip back command for a period of time after executing a previous skip back command. The claimed invention involves a user not taking an action for a period of time after a previous action to indicate to stop editing (not executing a skip ahead command for a period

of time after executing a previous skip ahead command, not executing a rewind command for a period of time after executing a previous rewind command, and not executing a skip back command for a period of time after executing a previous skip back command). Support for this amendment may be found in the specification at least on page 12, paragraphs [0030] and [0031] and Figure 3.

Lin and Abe, either taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest this claimed subject matter. For example, Abe states that a non-linear video edit system has first, second and third play modes which are selectable at time of playing a video for an edit. According to Abe, in the first play mode (EP TRIM), it plays a first cut scene (scene A) before an edit point and plays a second cut scene (scene B) after the edit point according to a play list. In the second play mode (PREV TRIM), it successively plays the first cut scene (scene A) before and after the edit point. Abe states that in the third play mode (NEXT TRIM), it successively plays the second cut scene (scene B) before and after the edit point. Abe further states that these play modes allows to change the play speed in an arbitrary direction by a dial, and to switch the play mode with one touch of the corresponding three buttons with aligning current positions. (See, e.g., Abe, Abstract). Abe describes specific edit keys for indicating when to start and stop editing. The claimed invention involves a user not taking an action for a period of time after a previous action to indicate to stop editing, as described above.

A careful review of Lin failed to teach or suggest the claimed subject matter, as discussed above. Lin discusses a method and device for editing to a picture of a group of pictures (GOP) in a DVD media without decoding and encoding of an MPEG encoded signal. The method includes the steps of: marking a user selected end picture to identify a selected

segment of the encoded signal to be edited; automatically identifying an actual end picture for

the selected segment based on a position of the user selected end picture relative to at least one

other picture within the encoded signal; and performing an edit function on an actual segment

delimited by the actual end picture (See, e.g., Lin, Abstract). Lin further discusses that the

identifying step with to the actual end picture includes assigning the actual end picture to be at

least one of an I picture and a P picture most nearly adjacent to the user selected picture if the

user selected end picture is not at least one of an I picture and a P picture. Lin further states that

the method can also include the step of blanking the actual end picture and deleting any B

pictures appearing between the user selected end picture and the actual end picture. According

to Lin, one aspect the step of identifying the actual end picture includes assigning the actual

end picture to be the user selected end picture if the user selected end picture is an I picture or a

P picture. (See, e.g., Lin, Abstract). Hence, Lin does not teach or suggest the claimed

invention of a user not taking an action for a period of time after a previous action to indicate to

stop editing, as described above.

Lin and Abe, either taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest this claimed

subject matter, as discussed above. For at least this reason, independent claims 1, 13 and 25

and their respective dependent claims are distinguishable from Lin and Abe, either taken alone

or in combination. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections to these

claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Applicant does not otherwise concede the correctness of the Office Action's rejection

with respect to any of the dependent claims discussed above. Accordingly, Applicant hereby

reserves the right to make additional arguments as may be necessary to further distinguish the

dependent claims from the cited references, taken alone or in combination, based on additional features contained in the dependent claims that were not discussed above. A detailed discussion of these differences is believed to be unnecessary at this time in view of the basic differences in the independent claims pointed out above.

New Claims 33-39

New dependent claims 33-39 are sought to be added. Dependent claims 33-39 are allowable over the art of record for at least the same reason as independent claim 24, as discussed above.

INVITATION FOR A TELEPHONE INTERVIEW

The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned, Molly A. McCall, at (703) 633-0931 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that all of the stated grounds of objections and rejections have been properly traversed accommodated or rendered moot. Thus, Applicant believes that the present application is in condition for allowance, and as such, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding objections and rejections, and allowance of this application.

<div style="margin-left: 50%;">

Respectfully submitted,

Intel Corporation

</div>

Dated: September 30, 2008

<div style="margin-left: 50%;">

/Molly A. McCall/ Reg. No. 46,126/
Molly A. McCall
Intel Corporation
c/o Intellevate, LLC
P.O. Box 52050
Minneapolis, MN 55402

</div>

P18835ReplyFinalOA